

# ITEMS

---

VOLUME 7 · NUMBER 3 · SEPTEMBER 1953  
230 PARK AVENUE · NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

## WENDELL CLARK BENNETT 1905-1953

In the tragic death of Wendell Bennett on September 6 the Council lost a most devoted and constructive member of its board of directors. To its work and its problems he gave unstintingly of his time and thought for nearly nine years. During this period the Council relied on him increasingly for fulfillment of exacting tasks of scholarship and administration. His contributions were constant and enduring; his associates in the work of the Council will feel a profound sense of loss for many years to come.

The importance of Professor Bennett's achievements in anthropological research has been widely recognized and is well known to social scientists in all fields. The Council is but one of the organizations that has had the benefit of his intellectual resources, sensitivity, and balanced judgment.

Before he became a director in 1945 the Council had shared with other sponsoring organizations the advantage of his membership on the Ethnogeographic Board, 1942-45. It is significant that he was chosen to write the history of that wartime agency; his objective account of its activities, published by the Smithsonian Institution in 1947, is an outstanding appraisal of the use of scholarly and scientific resources in the public service. During the early war years he was also executive officer of the Joint Committee on Latin American Studies, whose wartime aid to government was substantial.

The Council is deeply indebted to Wendell Bennett for his sustained and careful analysis of continuing problems of policy and operation, and for his discerning judgment, as a member of its Executive Committee since 1946 and its chairman since 1951. Of unique value to the Council were his tact and discrimination as chairman of the 1947 Committee on Aims, Organization, Operation, and Executive Leadership of the Council.

The field of area research and training and the Council's efforts to improve the social science aspects of area training programs owe much to Wendell Bennett's knowledge and interest. He was a member of the Council's Committee on World Area Research throughout its existence from 1946 to 1953, and his analytical report on its survey of the facilities for *Area Studies in American Universities*, published by the Council in June 1951, earned repeated expressions of gratitude and commendation from university and government administrators and others concerned with the development of scientific knowledge of different areas of the world.

When problems of evaluating programs for the international exchange of persons were felt to be acute by supporting foundations and government agencies, and the assistance of the Council was sought, it turned to Wendell Bennett for an assessment of appropriate Council activities relating to these problems. His work, in cooperation with other members of the staff, indicated a lack of established knowledge concerning the impact of American educational experience on foreign students, and defined the Council's role as that of planning and promoting research on such experience. As chairman of the resulting Committee on Cross-Cultural Education appointed in 1952, he guided the development of its plans with wisdom and foresight; and his counsel will be sorely missed as its work proceeds.

A complete list of the capacities in which Wendell Bennett served the Council would include many briefer assignments in which his willing cooperation and unfailing good humor lessened the burdens of officers and staff and won their lasting appreciation. Now and in the future, as in the past, the ability of the Council to accomplish its purpose depends on the selfless collaboration of social scientists such as he.

# THE CROSS-CULTURAL EDUCATION PROJECTS: A PROGRESS REPORT

by M. Brewster Smith and Joseph B. Casagrande

ONLY a year and a half ago, Wendell Bennett described in *Items*<sup>1</sup> a three-year program of research to be undertaken by the new Committee on Cross-Cultural Education of which he was chairman. His leadership and wisdom is lost to the Council just as the first year of exploratory work draws to a close and at a time when the committee faces important decisions on the direction of its ensuing efforts. The research described in this progress report bears the stamp of Professor Bennett's judgment that "there is no such person as 'the foreign student' but . . . there are many different types of foreign students . . . from many different cultural backgrounds and with widely varied academic preparation and motivations." Moreover, his dual concern for the integrity of individual scholarship and the joining of collaborative effort is reflected in the balance of autonomy and coordination in the projects. Continuity in building on the year's explorations is assured with the recent appointment of Ralph L. Beals of the University of California at Los Angeles as chairman of the committee.<sup>2</sup>

## BACKGROUND

The rapid growth of "exchange of persons" programs since the war, and the presumed significance of cultural interchange in these days of uneasy relations between nations, poses a challenge to research and administration alike and underlies the Council's decision to undertake research in this area. In addition, an annual foreign student population in the United States of approximately 30,000 young men and women from more than 100 different countries<sup>3</sup> provides a readily available resource for the firsthand study of cross-cultural education under semicontrolled conditions. At the same time, the sheer numbers of students and the financial investment they represent induce the government or foundation administrator to raise questions about the extent to which existing programs are meeting their objectives, and lead the educator to seek ways of improving their effectiveness. Concern on the part of administrators with the *evaluation* of educational exchange, in fact,

directed the Council's attention to problems of cross-cultural education.

Evaluation, however, presupposes agreement on objectives and standards; and the sort of constructive evaluation on which prescriptions for improvement might be based requires also an understanding of the causal processes at work. In the view of the committee, as outlined in Professor Bennett's article, the groundwork for scientific evaluative studies of student exchange was deficient on both scores. On the one hand, the private motives and public interests against which the results of foreign study might be measured were manifold and often ill-defined or even contradictory. On the other, knowledge both of the processes of adjustment and readjustment involved in foreign study and of the determinants of varying outcomes of foreign educational experience was scant and fragmentary. Factors leading to marked differences in individual attitudes, satisfactions, and socially available knowledge and skills derived from study abroad were at best dimly understood. The most constructive role for the Council, it seemed to the committee, was to plan and organize research aimed first at a more adequate natural history of these processes, and then at a more focused and systematic investigation of the determinants of the processes and outcomes identified in the initial explorations. Thus, while the Council's principal interest in this problem area is scientific, such studies promise results that may have practical application as well.

Support was obtained from the Carnegie Corporation, the Ford Foundation, and the Rockefeller Foundation for a three-year program of research on student exchange planned along these lines. The first year, just completed, was to be devoted to intensive exploratory investigations of present and former foreign students of four nationalities, in order to formulate hypotheses about factors affecting the experience of exchange students in the United States and in their home countries on their return. Students from India, Japan, Mexico, and the Scandinavian countries were selected for the intensive study. The choice of national groups was guided by a desire to obtain a range of cultural, racial, political, and historical contrasts as well as by such practical considerations as the availability of both subjects and competent and interested investigators.

The studies abroad of returned former students were under the general direction of Cora Du Bois of the Institute of International Education. Norman D. Humphrey

<sup>1</sup> "Research in Cross-Cultural Education," *Items*, March 1952, pp. 3-6.

<sup>2</sup> The other members of the committee are Cora Du Bois, Institute of International Education; Herbert Hyman, Columbia University; Ronald Lippitt, University of Michigan; Charles P. Loomis, Michigan State College; staff, Joseph B. Casagrande, M. Brewster Smith, and Bryce Wood.

<sup>3</sup> The 1952-53 annual census of foreign students in institutions of higher education in the United States conducted by the Institute of International Education enumerated 33,675 young men and women from 128 different nations or other administrative units.

of Wayne University interviewed former exchange students in Mexico; Herbert Passin, formerly of the University of California, conducted the studies in Japan; while Franklin D. Scott of Northwestern University conducted those in Sweden. Studies of former exchange students in India, previously planned by John and Ruth Useem of Michigan State College under the auspices of the Hazen Foundation, were carried out concurrently in close collaboration with the projects organized by the committee.

In the United States, Mexican students were studied at the University of California at Los Angeles by Ralph L. Beals; Japanese students, at Ohio State University by John W. Bennett; Scandinavian students, at the University of Wisconsin by William H. Sewell; and Indian students, at the University of Pennsylvania by Richard D. Lambert. In each of these "domestic" projects, which were coordinated by Brewster Smith of the Council staff, the principal investigator had the assistance of one or more collaborators.

## LAUNCHING THE EXPLORATIONS

The exploratory purpose of the year's research presented the investigators with difficult problems of planning and strategy. They were confronted not with a well-defined theoretical problem, but with a scientifically challenging problem area that was conceptually unmapped. Rather than being able to build their research on prior understanding of the factors likely to be significant and the hypotheses worth pursuing, they were faced with planning research that would itself help to identify the important variables and promising hypotheses. The task of marshalling their coordinated efforts toward this end was further complicated by the diversity of specialized training of the investigators, which included in most cases close acquaintance with the culture and history of the national group to be studied, but ranged from history through anthropology and sociology to psychology. Aside from the interdisciplinary differences in perspective and method to be bridged, the bare facts of geography rendered collaboration difficult for investigators not only on four campuses but also widely scattered in four quarters of the world. The fullest possible discussion among the investigators such as might have been afforded by a summer seminar would clearly have been highly desirable before the collection of data began. However, exigencies of timing permitted much less extensive preparation.

A week-long conference early in July 1952 gave those who were to conduct the foreign studies their only opportunity to meet prior to their departure for the field. During the latter part of this conference they were

joined by the "domestic" group, and the basis was laid for as full communication as possible between members of the two teams concerned with students from the same country. At this conference it was agreed that each member of the foreign team would seek to make up to 50 intensive case studies, including persons who had studied in the United States before and after World War II. No serious attempt at achieving representative samples was deemed feasible, but variety was to be sought in regard to such conditioning factors as sex, social and economic status, profession or occupation, success of readjustment, and level and period of study in the United States. A preliminary conceptual scheme and a list of relevant topics for investigation were prepared as guides for the conduct of unstructured interviews. The foreign team agreed to convene again on completion of their field work in August 1953, in order to pool the hypotheses and tentative conclusions from their case studies.

The research teams at the four universities in the United States took advantage of opportunity for more intercommunication in the formative stages of their work. Before meeting with the foreign group in July, the project directors had already had two sessions to formulate their plans, and they met again several times during the year. In each of the domestic projects the entire available population of students of the assigned nationality on the university campus was included. (In the Mexican project at U.C.L.A., subjects were also obtained from other Los Angeles campuses.) Approximately 20 subjects of each nationality were available. Of these, the smaller number of students who had newly arrived at the beginning of the academic year were studied more intensively.

Prior to the launching of the studies, Herbert Hyman prepared for the committee a preliminary list of independent and dependent variables potentially relevant to studies of the experience and adjustment of foreign students in the United States. After discussion and revision of this list by the domestic group, an interview guide was drawn up which facilitated the gathering of roughly comparable data in each of the four projects. In addition to free or loosely structured interviews, the projects relied in varying degree on questionnaires and tests. Although some instruments were used in more than one project, it did not prove feasible to administer any single instrument to the subjects of all four projects. At the end of the academic year, a minimal core of comparable data was assured as the investigators rated and ranked each of their intensively studied subjects on 23 variables, following a common scheme.



## THE ITHACA CONFERENCE

The conference planned a year earlier, at which the members of the foreign team were to discuss their hypotheses and tentative findings, took place at Cornell University on August 8-16. Those who had made the studies in Japan, Mexico, and Sweden were present, but the directors of the study in India were unable to attend because their plans called for a longer stay in the field. Some account of their work and preliminary findings was provided by Herbert Passin, who had visited the Indian project en route from Japan. Representatives of the domestic studies joined the foreign group and committee staff for the latter part of the conference period. The conference was thus the occasion not only for the foreign group to formulate the conceptual outcome of their work, but also for a general stocktaking of all the related studies as they neared completion.<sup>4</sup> Since the formal preliminary reports of the domestic projects are still in preparation, this account draws largely on presentations and discussion at Ithaca.

During the first days of the conference the group heard reports on the conduct of the studies in the several foreign countries, on the nature of the data collected, and on technical problems encountered in the research. This sharing of field experiences served the highly useful purpose of sharpening the individual investigator's understanding of his own data by seeing them arrayed against comparable material from other countries. The person who was reporting found himself in the role of expert informant on one country as he was questioned by his colleagues. The foreign investigators all reported success in varying measure in accomplishing the research tasks. First, drawing from earlier familiarity with their countries and from a rather wide range of social contacts and literary sources as well as from the formal interviews, they had been able to formulate fairly coherent impressions of the facts of national life to which the student had to accommodate on his return. Second, they had obtained intensive interviews, organized as more or less full-length case studies, with a number of returned students. Although the subjects in no case constituted a strictly representative sample of a definable population, they embraced considerable variety in social background, American experience, and career after return. Third, the investigators had made some progress in extracting from these data some tentative

conclusions and hypotheses relating the variables that seemed most salient.

Exigencies in the field situation made for variation both in the ability to approximate the goal of about 50 case studies, and in the characteristic intensiveness and level of intimacy of the interviews. Ease of access to potential subjects and the reception accorded to such a demanding and essentially "American" investigation, as well as subjects' willingness to cooperate, differed from country to country. The most adequate cases, on which the investigators were able to speak with some assurance, had required about eight hours of interviewing, distributed over several sessions in club, restaurant, or home, and frequently augmented by considerable informal social contact during the course of the year. The field workers who were in the best position to gain full acceptance already had a considerable circle of friends and acquaintances in the country; at the conclusion of the study they left many more friends behind them among the subjects of their study.

Even apart from the substantive data, the problems encountered in interviewing served to confirm the committee's working assumption that the "foreign student" is not a universal type. The conference heard, for example, of the different interviewing problems presented by Japanese men and Japanese women. The former had long since learned to inhibit the expression of feeling and were little practiced in introspective analysis. Nonetheless the American interviewer, using Japanese or English as the subject desired, was able to obtain satisfactory material, especially when he learned to cast his questions in an objective autobiographical framework. The situation was different with Japanese women. A salient feature of their American experience was temporary freedom from the constraints of their subordinate relationship to Japanese men. A male American interviewer was not able to create a satisfactory interview relationship. It was even less rewarding for a Japanese male assistant to interview Japanese women. The solution, which proved to be highly satisfactory, was to have Japanese women interviewed by an American woman, with whom they tended to engage in a kind of catharsis of their American experience quite in contrast with the carefully restrained accounts elicited from the Japanese men.

Similar contrasts in the characteristic response to the interview situation among the other national groups also impressed the conference. Different standards of privacy tended to make many of the interviewer's questions unacceptable to the returned Mexican. The American-educated Indian exhibited a verbal fluency which not only taxed the interviewer's powers of record-

<sup>4</sup> In attendance at the conference were Norman D. Humphrey, Herbert Passin, Franklin D. Scott, and Cora Du Bois of the foreign studies; Ralph L. Beals, John W. Bennett, Olaf Davidson, Iwao Ishino, Richard D. Lambert, Richard T. Morris, and William H. Sewell of the domestic studies; and Joseph B. Casagrande and M. Brewster Smith of the committee staff.

ing but, in its culturally patterned conventions of introspection, presented him with interpretative problems of disentangling the personally valid from the culturally stereotyped. The Scandinavian responded to questions on his American experience with tempered objectivity. Such differences in the interviewing process had evident bearing on the way in which American study must have impinged on students from these diverse national backgrounds.

## FOCUS ON NATIONAL GROUPS

The reports of the foreign research team on their procedures and problems led the conference to discuss their hypotheses and tentative conclusions. Since the focus of each study was on a single national group, it was natural that the initial formulations tended to be couched in relatively concrete terms specific to the nationality studied. A more generalized and comparative formulation—one which would necessarily be more abstract—could only emerge at the conference itself as the participants considered uniformities and disparities in the provisional data. A small sampling of these hypotheses and tentative conclusions that related to particular countries may convey some of the flavor of the enterprise. It seemed to the participants that such relatively concrete findings, when confirmed or revised in more thorough analysis of the material and in subsequent research, would have potential value for persons concerned with administration of programs for foreign students.

The different meaning of American experience to women and men as it emerged from the Japanese study has been mentioned. While both sexes encountered obvious problems of adjustment, sojourn in America for the women was more likely to be accompanied by a sense of liberation and release. The more serious problem awaited them on their return; although Japanese life provides increasing opportunities for women with Westernized outlook, those who expect to rejoin the main currents of the society have still to come to terms with a way of life that closes many avenues of self-realization that were opened to them in America. For the men, on the other hand, sensitive as they were to maintaining their position in a highly ordered system of reciprocal personal relations, the gropings of initial adjustment to the United States seemed particularly damaging to their self-esteem. Many of those who had held one-year U. S. Government scholarships since the war were compelled to end their sojourn before this self-diminishing experience had been worked through. Conversely, of course, they faced less serious problems of readjustment on return than persons who had

achieved a more satisfactory adjustment to American life during a longer sojourn. The residual tensions left by their experience, however, often found outlet in unfriendly reactions to this country.

The Japanese study also emphasized the importance of the integration of the student's American training into an established career in his home country. This consideration emerges almost as sharply from the Mexican material and is relevant in some degree to all the countries studied. Professional success in Japan, as elsewhere, requires high competence. But opportunity to demonstrate competence depends crucially on personal associations established in high school and college with the student's peer group and with influential persons in the field that he hopes to enter. Unless the Japanese student comes to the United States as a mature specialist with his professional position already well established, he risks being cut adrift from this strategic social network and being able to establish suitable connections on his return only with great difficulty if at all. His situation is complicated by the fact that the road to professional eminence is straight, narrow, and well understood: it leads from one of a number of preferred preparatory schools through one of the Imperial universities, all of which have higher prestige than any foreign institution. It is most difficult for the person who strays from the optimal career line to recoup his position.

The investigation of Scandinavian students at Wisconsin brought out one way in which American study may be employed in just such a recouping operation. Professional training in engineering in Norway is open to only a very few students, on a highly selective and competitive basis. A degree from an American engineering school gives good students who have failed to gain admission to the national institute the chance to re-enter their chosen professional path and thus by-pass the obstacle that would otherwise have closed it for them.

Educational systems that contrasted with American practice were found in all the countries studied. These systems gave the exchange student confused expectations of American universities and also hindered recognition of his American training on his return. With its greater stress on governmental validation of professional degrees than elsewhere, neighboring Mexico posed as acute problems of this kind for the returned student as did any of the more remote countries. Experience in the Swedish project suggested that the timing of foreign study in the educational career may determine how the contrast is experienced by the student, and therefore color his reactions to the American sojourn. Swedish gymnasias, in common with higher schools in Europe generally, demand a high degree of discipline from the

student and give him none of the adult freedom to govern his own studies and conduct that is characteristic of continental university life. It was reported that students who entered American universities, even at an advanced level, after a taste of the Swedish university were more irritated by fixed assignments, compulsory attendance, periodic examinations, and the like than were those who came directly from the more restrictive gymnasium regime. The greater informality in relations between student and professor, on the other hand, seemed to be a distinctive feature of American education that came to be welcomed by students from all the national groups.

The pressures to order, evaluate, and express judgments on a welter of impressions of American life and to consider one's own country in the light of American experience are an inescapable accompaniment of foreign residence, particularly for a student group in the United States. This problem is especially acute for students from newly established nations with recent colonial histories, where cultural contrasts with the United States are great, and it received particular attention in the domestic study of Indian students. One provisional finding brought to the conference was that the American's comments or questions about India, whether encountered from the naive or the well-informed or in the press, almost inevitably touched on sensitive areas of national pride such as caste, famine, Hindu-Muslim relations, or the incidence of disease. Short of complete control over, or insulation from, the climate of information and opinion that faces the Indian student in America—unattainable even if it were desirable—basic affronts to the student's sense of national dignity seem unavoidable. These are simply features of the situation with which the student has to deal in one way or another; how he does so, of course, has presumably much to do with the attitudes and impressions that he takes home from the United States.

#### ATTEMPTS AT GENERALIZATION

Observations and provisional conclusions like the above were grist for attempts to formulate the processes of educational exchange in more general terms—a central preoccupation of the conference. Reports from the various studies revealed a contrast between the Swedish and other Scandinavian students on the one hand, and the remaining nationalities on the other, which served to polarize much of the discussion of comparisons. The Scandinavians seemed to approach America in a singularly objective, even practical frame of mind. They felt under no compelling obligation to pronounce themselves "for" or "against" in global terms. What they

thought of America and of their home country was not an issue; rather, they were interested in finding here what might be useful to them. Mostly they reported good experiences, but their appraisal of America, differentiated and objective as it tended to be, was relatively free from entanglement in emotional reactions to their course of study or personal circumstances in America. Apart from their problems with an unfamiliar educational system and their surprise at American dating patterns and sex mores, to mention two among several cultural contrasts that were mildly disturbing, their problems seemed very much like those of American students.

The picture presented by the other nationality groups diverged in varying degrees. The difference was accentuated when an emergent or resurgent nationalism was coupled with problems bearing on international relations between America and the home country. To the extent that such factors came to the fore, defensive reactions pressing toward over-all acceptance or rejection of American experience were more common. Ambivalent attitudes were frequent, in which the nature of the student's emotionally charged response when queried about America depended in good part on the circumstances in which it was evoked. Since the student felt his personal commitment to a national way of life at stake, adjustment to the American scene tended to be the more difficult and, to the extent that he adjusted, the possibility of ultimate alienation from his home culture gave him greater concern.

Two clusters of related factors around which the conference came to organize many of its provisional formulations, therefore, centered respectively on national status as involved in the student's identifications, and on self-esteem. The experience of the year's studies seemed in agreement with standard psychodynamic assumptions that rational, constructive coping with adjustive difficulties depends on healthy self-esteem and tends to break down when it is jeopardized or diminished. A number of factors in the situation of the newly arrived exchange student were seen as at least potentially challenging to self-esteem, while different reactions to such challenges appeared to have widely ramifying effects on ability to study, the establishment of satisfactory personal relationships in America, and the residue of attitudes and impressions with which the student returned. Whatever the individual's motivations in coming to the United States, moreover, he was inevitably cast to some extent in the role of cultural ambassador, so that his awareness of his nationality was likely to be heightened. Where national status was insecure, or sensed to be low in the eyes of Americans, the entire complex of reactions



to threatened self-esteem appeared to be readily evoked. An attempt was made, for the guidance of the committee, to delineate some of the causal sequences that seemed to center on national status and self-esteem and so to influence the phasing and outcome of the foreign student's adjustment and readjustment.

Among other problem areas that were tentatively defined at the Ithaca conference in terms that cut across particular nationalities, only a small sampling can be listed here. It seemed possible to distinguish characteristic phases in the sojourn experience: an initial spectator phase, an adjustive phase as the student becomes seriously involved with the cultural maze that it is his task to learn, a phase in which the student has found some way of dealing with the adjustive problems that confront him, and a pre-return phase in which the problems of readjustment loom larger on the horizon. Brief "junkets" that do not demand the serious participation of the visitor may leave him merely a spectator, a role that involves little threat but also has little potentiality for important effects.

The conference speculated about other factors that might influence the rate at which a student moves through these phases, but was not ready to formulate the problem more systematically. The question whether a similar conception of phases of readjustment on return might prove useful in examining the conditions under which the returned student is integrated effectively into the national life, or left as a deviant, was also raised but without provisional answer. Psychological theories of learning provided leads as to conditions likely to result in the acquisition of transferable knowledge and skills. Through attempts to state and put into a schematic framework hypotheses on such aspects of the processes and outcome of cross-cultural education, it was possible to identify for the committee meaningful segments of this general area for its guidance in planning further research.

### SOME IMPRESSIONS

The Ithaca conference left the writers with some general impressions that are in no sense proved by the year's explorations but seem worth recording lest the broader implications of the work be lost to sight. One is that the urgent American wish for foreign students to like us, both while here and as they leave this country, is primarily an American problem, and only secondarily, as this wish is somewhat importunately conveyed to them, a problem that is relevant in the foreign students' own concerns. General "attitude toward the United States," one of the "outcome variables" con-

sidered in both domestic and foreign studies, proved quite elusive and of dubious significance. Where problems of comparative national status were minor, the subject's preference for a discriminating response that left him free to pick and choose was clear. Where status problems fostered sweeping judgments, American insistence on being liked made little apparent contribution to the desired result. It is probably fair to say that most of the investigators came from their experience with the feeling that the extent to which we are liked as Americans offers an inappropriate focus for either research or policy.

Reports from the foreign studies, moreover, gave the impression that the net attitude toward his experience with which a student leaves this country may have little to do with the stand he finds himself taking once his feet are firmly planted on home ground. For example, what seemed to him to be a rather frustrating and not wholly satisfactory training experience while he was in the United States may be transformed in his eyes and words upon his return, as he realizes that the social capital of his American visit is enhanced if he treats it as a thing of great positive value. Or, to cite a recurrent contrary theme, a student who returns after a generally favorable adjustment to this country may find his Americanization suspect in a social climate that is momentarily unfriendly to America or preoccupied with its own national values. Under such circumstances he may wisely disguise the extent to which his American experience has had an impact on him, or even affect an anti-American stance as a way of validating his right to be reincorporated in his own national group. In this connection one need only call to mind the reversal of roles of Russian- and American-educated Chinese in Communist China today. None of these eventualities means that the student's foreign sojourn has gone for naught, even in respect to the advancement of friendly understanding among nations. But it may well be a mistake to expect a simple relationship between study in the United States under the best of conditions and the development of favorable sentiments toward this country abroad.

Nor may we assume that there is a perfect correspondence between satisfactory personal adjustment and increased understanding of the United States on the one hand, and academic achievement on the other. In fact the two may work at cross purposes. The student who is rebuffed in his attempts to establish close personal relationships with Americans may turn the more diligently to his studies; the graduate student may seldom emerge from his laboratory to widen his knowledge of American life. Yet years later both may report favorable attitudes

toward the United States and recall their American experience with evident satisfaction. A further impression arising from discussion of the domestic studies is that living conditions, systems of advisers, orientation programs, and the various other detailed arrangements that are likely to preoccupy those concerned with the welfare of foreign students play a secondary role in the student's satisfaction with and profit from his stay, and in the attitudes toward his experience that he takes home with him. Not that these matters are trivial; rather they seem to be overshadowed by what takes place in the broad area of interpersonal relations, and by the extent to which it is possible for him to achieve realistically formulated objectives, such as command of particular techniques or subject matter. Living arrangements become significant as they channel the interpersonal relations that are open to him. Similarly, other administrative arrangements of course have repercussions on these important areas.

### THE COMMITTEE LOOKS AHEAD

The studies that have been partially described above were designed as exploratory. They have yielded impressions, hypotheses, and sharper definitions of the problem, but not, for the most part, firm conclusions. Having scrupulously avoided determining the direction

of its future program until the results of the exploratory studies were available, the Committee on Cross-Cultural Education is now in a position to plan a more systematic attack on its problems than would previously have been possible. Since the planning and organizing of research takes time, it seems reasonable to expect that no major venture will be launched during the current academic year.

In the meantime, possibilities have opened for collaboration with the Fulbright program. The Fulbright foundations in Austria, Germany, Greece, Italy, and Pakistan have stated that they would welcome research by Fulbright grantees pointed toward the evaluation of educational exchange; and there is prospect that opportunities for such research under Fulbright grants may not be limited to these countries. Arrangements for developing mutually productive collaboration with the committee's research are now being explored.

Research on student exchange and cross-cultural education, the committee realizes, is an active and expanding field, of which the committee's program is but a small part. In order to attain perspective on the field, the committee has sought through its staff to get in touch with related research in progress or being planned. Persons who have an active interest in this area are invited to communicate with Brewster Smith of the Council staff.

## COMMITTEE BRIEFS

### AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

H. B. James (chairman), Lee R. Martin (secretary), R. G. Bressler, Jr., J. K. Galbraith, Earl O. Heady, D. Gale Johnson, Glenn L. Johnson, William H. Nicholls, Kenneth H. Parsons, Frederick V. Waugh.

Since the appointment of the committee last spring, two subcommittees have been designated and have made substantial progress with their assignments. The Subcommittee on Handbooks on Research Techniques consists of Earl O. Heady of Iowa State College (chairman), R. L. Anderson and Clifford Hildreth of North Carolina State College, and Frederick V. Waugh of the U. S. Bureau of Agricultural Economics. After extensive correspondence this subcommittee met at North Carolina State College in July and tentatively outlined a handbook on the application of empirical techniques in agricultural economics research. The Subcommittee on Appraisal and Planning of Research consists of William H. Nicholls of Vanderbilt University (chairman), J. K. Galbraith of Harvard University, D. Gale Johnson of the University of Chicago, and Kenneth H. Parsons of the University of Wisconsin. This group held its first

meeting at the University of Chicago in May. It is preparing a report on research relating to rural areas characterized by low incomes and low productivity in agriculture; correspondence with many departments of agricultural economics throughout the United States provided part of the data for this report. The materials prepared by the two subcommittees and their recommendations will be considered at a meeting of the main committee to be held in November.

### ECONOMIC GROWTH

Simon Kuznets (chairman), Shepard B. Clough, Richard Hartshorne, Edgar M. Hoover, Wilbert E. Moore, Morris E. Opler, Joseph J. Spengler.

On September 10-11 a conference on research on southern economic development was held at Vanderbilt University, under the auspices of the committee. The conference was planned and organized by William H. Nicholls of Vanderbilt and B. U. Ratchford of Duke University. It reviewed the research now under way on economic change in the



South, considered means of achieving more effective communication among research workers with a common interest in this field, discussed possible gaps in the relevant research now in process or contemplated, and made recommendations for a second conference of similar character to be held next year.

In addition to the chairmen, 29 persons attended the conference: Howard Beers, University of Kentucky; C. E. Bishop, North Carolina State College; J. C. D. Blaine, University of North Carolina; J. M. Buchanan, Florida State University; Dorothy Dickins, Mississippi State College; E. J. Eberling, Vanderbilt University; Langston Hawley, University of Alabama; W. E. Hendrix, University of Chicago; Donald L. Henry, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis; Homer L. Hitt, Louisiana State University; Werner Hochwald, Washington University; John Hope, Fisk University; D. Gale Johnson, University of Chicago; Arthur Kantner, Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta; Erven Long, University of Tennessee; Clifton B. Luttrell, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, Memphis Branch; John MacLachlan, University of Florida; Harold Miller, Tennessee State Planning Commission; Albert J. Reiss, Jr., Vanderbilt University; Fletcher Riggs, Vanderbilt University; Stefan Robock, Tennessee Valley Authority; Vernon Ruttan, Tennessee Valley Authority; R. J. Saville, Mississippi State College; Stephen Smith, Tennessee Valley Authority; Ellsworth Steele, Alabama Polytechnic Institute; George W. Stocking, Vanderbilt University; Ernst Swanson, Emory University; Anthony Tang, Vanderbilt University; Henry Taylor, Tennessee Agricultural and Industrial State University.

#### HUMAN RESOURCES AND ADVANCED TRAINING

*(Appointed by the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils)*

Charles E. Odegaard (chairman), M. H. Trytten (vice-chairman), Donald Bridgman, Aaron J. Brumbaugh, C. W. de Kiewiet, Ovid W. Eshbach, E. D. Grizzell, Quinn McNemar, Ralph A. Sawyer, Frederick F. Stephan, Paul Webbink, Malcolm M. Willey; *Director*, Dael Wolfe.

The first phase of the work of the Commission has been completed. Information concerning the nation's scientists, social scientists, humanists, and professional men and women, and concerning students potentially qualified for work in these fields has been obtained through a number of special studies conducted by the Commission and through the generosity of other agencies and individuals interested in specialized manpower problems. The results of these studies will be published in the spring of 1954. The report traces the increased demand since 1900 for men and women trained in the professional and other specialized fields and projects the demand to 1960. The supply of college-educated persons is similarly traced historically and projected to 1960. Other sections of the report give accounts of the occupational distribution in 1953 of a sample of the nation's population that has graduated from college, of the utilization of educated persons, and of the large

number of potentially qualified students who do not get to college.

Work has also begun on what will be the Commission's two final studies. One consists of a survey, by group testing methods, of personality differences among students who are preparing for careers in different specialized fields. The other consists of a follow-up of high school graduates of some years ago who at the time of high school graduation appeared potentially well qualified for work in the specialized fields, but who did not secure the college education that might have prepared them for work in those fields. The Commission's interest here is in determining more accurately how society makes use of talented men and women who do not receive the education that is becoming increasingly necessary for work in one of the specialized fields.

D. W.

#### PACIFIC COAST COMMITTEE

##### ON OLD AGE RESEARCH

Harold E. Jones (chairman), Ray E. Baber, Roy M. Dorcus, M. Bruce Fisher, James A. Hamilton, Oscar J. Kaplan, Clark Kerr, Elon H. Moore.

During the four years of its existence this committee sponsored two conferences on problems of aging, conducted an interuniversity summer research seminar on old age research, and assisted in the work of the research division of the Governor's Conference on Problems of Aging. Recent meetings have been concerned with the discussion of progress reports from the Institute of Industrial Relations (University of California, Berkeley) study of aging and retirement, with reference to political, economic, and psychological aspects of problems in this area. In view of the committee's interest in facilitating communication among research workers in several disciplines concerned with problems of aging, activities during the past year have been directed toward preparation for a Pacific Coast meeting of the Gerontological Society. With the formation of a Western affiliate of this society, the committee terminated its work in August 1953.

H. E. J.

#### PACIFIC COAST COMMITTEE

##### ON SOCIAL STATISTICS

Maurice I. Gershenson (chairman), Genevieve W. Carter, Emily H. Huntington, George M. Kuznets, Davis McEntire, Calvin F. Schmid, Walter T. Martin, Jacob Yerushalmy.

Under the auspices of the committee a conference on population trends on the Pacific Coast was held at Asilomar, Pacific Grove, California, on May 21-22. Calvin Schmid of the University of Washington served as chairman. Papers presented covered the following topics: population composition and distribution, trends in fertility and mortality, population and school enrollment forecasts, and demographic research. A total of 28 persons attended, including representatives from six campuses on the Pacific Coast, four

state governmental agencies, and two federal agencies. In addition there were representatives from three foundations and other organizations.

On June 30 the committee sponsored a half-day meeting in Berkeley on nonsampling errors. P. V. Sukhatme, Chief of the Statistics Branch, Economics Division, United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization, served as consultant and presented a paper based on his recent work on response errors.

As an addition to the series of conferences that have been held on social statistics in the fields of income, social welfare, public health, morbidity, and population, plans are now being drawn for a conference on labor statistics, proposed for the early part of 1954.

H. E. J.

#### WESTERN COMMITTEE ON REGIONAL ECONOMIC ANALYSIS

David A. Revzan (chairman), Ernest A. Engelbert, Morris E. Garnsey, E. T. Grether, J. A. Guthrie, William O. Jones, Philip Neff, ElRoy Nelson, Harry S. Schwartz, Paul B. Simpson, Edward L. Ullman, Nathaniel Wollman.

The committee was appointed in September 1952 to plan and sponsor a second Western conference on regional economics. This conference was held in Berkeley on June 25-27.

In addition to members of the committee, invited guests delivered papers and participated in the discussion, and other guests attended the committee's sessions. Building on last year's work, the conference was concerned primarily with the data and methodological tools needed for regional economic analysis, with emphasis on the region of the eleven Western states. The topics discussed included an appraisal of the economic development of the West and its subregions in terms of the types of data available and needed; commodity and financial flow analysis, with special reference to the shifting pattern of commodity flows in the West; implications of the Report of the President's Material Policy Commission for the eleven Western states; the historical framework for an analysis of regional economic development, and problems of the West in transition; the improvement of the structure and methods of regional economic analysis, including a discussion of the regional application of the input-output technique. During the coming year the committee will be concerned with the improvement of basic data and the development of a theoretical framework for study of interregional relationships in terms of balance of payments, flows of goods and services, financial flows, physical linkages such as transportation and communication, mobility of population, and public and private decision-making processes.

D. A. R.

## PERSONNEL

#### RESEARCH TRAINING FELLOWSHIPS

Since making the appointments listed in the June 1953 issue of *Items* the Committee on Social Science Personnel has made three additional awards:

Phillip J. Nelson, Ph.D. candidate in economics, Columbia University, for research on the relationship between consumption patterns and productive efficiency.

Marvin E. Rozen, Ph.D. candidate in economics, University of California, Berkeley, for research in England on postwar British national investment policy.

Janusz K. Zawodny, Ph.D. candidate in political science, Stanford University, for research on the position of workers in the Soviet factory.

#### DIRECTORS AND OFFICERS OF THE COUNCIL

At the annual meeting of the board of directors of the Council held in September, Philip E. Mosely of Columbia University was elected a director-at-large for the two-year term 1954-55. Robert B. Hall and Donald G. Marquis of the University of Michigan and Malcolm M. Willey of the University of Minnesota were re-elected directors-at-large for the same term.

George W. Stocking of Vanderbilt University was elected chairman of the board of directors; Fred Eggan of the University of Chicago, vice-chairman; Gordon A. Craig of

Princeton University, secretary; and Ernest R. Hilgard of Stanford University, treasurer. The following members of the board were elected as its Executive Committee: Donald G. Marquis of the University of Michigan (chairman), John P. Miller of Yale University, Mortimer Spiegelman of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, Schuyler C. Wallace of Columbia University, and Donald Young of the Russell Sage Foundation. S. S. Wilks of Princeton University was renamed chairman of the Committee on Problems and Policy, and Douglas McGregor of Antioch College and Roy F. Nichols of the University of Pennsylvania were elected members of the committee for three-year terms. The other members of this committee are Joseph J. Spengler of Duke University, Conrad Taeuber of the Bureau of the Census, Malcolm M. Willey of the University of Minnesota, and ex officio: Pendleton Herring, George W. Stocking, and Fred Eggan.

#### APPOINTMENTS TO COUNCIL COMMITTEES

George W. Stocking has been renamed chairman of the Committee on Grants-in-Aid for 1953-54. Harvey Mansfield of Ohio State University and C. Vann Woodward of Johns Hopkins University are newly appointed members; and Richard Crutchfield of the University of California and John W. Riley, Jr. of Rutgers University have been reappointed to the committee.

Earl Latham of Amherst College has been reappointed chairman of the Committee on Social Science Personnel, which has charge of the Council's research training fellowship program. Richard B. Heflebower of Northwestern University has been newly appointed to the committee, and the following members have been reappointed for the year 1953-54: Ralph L. Beals of the University of California at Los Angeles, John A. Clausen of the National Institute of Mental Health, John H. Rohrer of Tulane University, and Paul Webbink of the Social Science Research Council.

McGeorge Bundy of Harvard University in August resigned his membership on the Committee on Civil-Military Relations Research.

Ralph L. Beals has been named chairman of the Committee on Cross-Cultural Education, succeeding Wendell C. Bennett who died September 6.

Richard Hartshorne of the University of Wisconsin has been named a member of the Committee on Economic Growth.

Floyd G. Lounsbury of Yale University has been named chairman of the Committee on Linguistics and Psychology, succeeding Charles E. Osgood, who remains a member of the committee. Joseph Greenberg of Columbia University and James J. Jenkins of the University of Minnesota have been newly appointed to the committee; and George A.

Miller of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology has resigned.

Benjamin Malzberg of the New York State Department of Mental Hygiene has been named a member of the Committee on Migration Differentials.

Walter T. Martin of the University of Oregon has been appointed to the Pacific Coast Committee on Social Statistics.

David B. Truman of Columbia University has been named chairman of the Committee on Political Behavior, succeeding V. O. Key of Harvard University.

Erich Lindemann of Harvard University has been appointed a member of the Committee on Psychiatry and Social Science Research.

Irving L. Janis of Yale University and William H. Sewell of the University of Wisconsin have been appointed members of the Committee on Social Behavior. David F. Aberle of the University of Michigan and William E. Henry of the University of Chicago have been appointed to its Subcommittee on Child Development. John W. M. Whiting of Harvard University has succeeded Robert R. Sears of Stanford University as chairman of the subcommittee.

David A. Revzan of the University of California has been appointed chairman of the Western Committee on Regional Economic Analysis for 1953-54, succeeding E. T. Grether.

## PUBLICATIONS

### COUNCIL BULLETINS AND MONOGRAPHS

*Adjustment to Physical Handicap and Illness: A Survey of the Social Psychology of Physique and Disability*, Bulletin 55, revised edition, by Roger G. Barker, in collaboration with Beatrice A. Wright, Lee Meyerson, Mollie R. Gonick. April 1953. 456 pp. \$2.00.

*Social Behavior and Personality: Contributions of W. I. Thomas to Theory and Social Research*, edited by Edmund H. Volkart. June 1951. 348 pp. Cloth, \$3.00.

*Support for Independent Scholarship and Research* by Elbridge Sibley. Report of an inquiry jointly sponsored by the American Philosophical Society and the Social Science Research Council. May 1951. 131 pp. \$1.25.

*Area Research: Theory and Practice*, Bulletin 63, by Julian H. Steward. August 1950. 183 pp. \$1.50.

*Culture Conflict and Crime*, Bulletin 41, by Thorsten Sellin. 1938; reprinted September 1950. 116 pp. \$1.00.

*Tensions Affecting International Understanding: A Survey of Research*, Bulletin 62, by Otto Klineberg. May 1950. 238 pp. Paper, \$1.75; cloth, \$2.25.

*Labor-Management Relations: A Research Planning Memorandum*, Bulletin 61, by John G. Turnbull. October 1949. 121 pp. \$1.25.

*The Pre-election Polls of 1948: Report to the Committee on Analysis of Pre-election Polls and Forecasts*, Bulletin 60, by Frederick Mosteller, Herbert Hyman, Philip J. McCarthy, Eli S. Marks, David B. Truman, with the collaboration of L. W. Doob, Duncan MacRae, Jr., F. F. Stephan, S. A. Stouffer, S. S. Wilks. September 1949. 416 pp. Paper, \$1.75; cloth, \$2.25.

### PAMPHLETS

*Bibliographies on Personality and Social Development of the Child*, Pamphlet 10, compiled by Christoph Heinicke and Beatrice B. Whiting. June 1953. 138 pp. \$1.00.

*Exchange of Persons: The Evolution of Cross-Cultural Education*, Pamphlet 9, by Guy S. Métraux. June 1952. 58 pp. 50 cents.

*Area Studies in American Universities* by Wendell C. Bennett. 1951. 92 pp. \$1.00.

*Domestic Control of Atomic Energy*, Pamphlet 8, by Robert A. Dahl and Ralph S. Brown, Jr. 1951. 122 pp. \$1.00.

All publications listed are distributed from the New York office of the Council.



# ANNOUNCEMENTS

## FELLOWSHIPS AND GRANTS

Announcements of fellowships and grants to be offered by the Council in 1954 are scheduled for distribution early in October 1953. Research Training Fellowships, Faculty Research Fellowships, Grants-in-Aid of Research, and Undergraduate Research Stipends will be offered on substantially the same basis as in previous years.

Area Research Training Fellowships and Travel Grants for Area Research will not be available in 1954. However, some persons who had anticipated applying for either of these awards may be eligible to apply for the regular Research Training Fellowships or Grants-in-Aid of Research respectively. No session of the Summer Institute in Mathematics for Social Scientists will be held in 1954, although it is planned to hold another session in a subsequent year.

The deadline for applications will be January 4, 1954, and it is hoped that applicants can be notified of decisions of the committees on April 1. Prospective candidates for fellowships are especially urged to communicate with the

Council in the autumn in order that the staff may arrange to interview as many as possible during the coming months.

Applications should be submitted on forms that will be supplied by the Council. Preliminary inquiries, briefly indicating age, academic status, vocational aims, the nature of proposed training or research, and the type and approximate amount of financial support required, should be addressed to the Council's Washington office, 726 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

## ADDRESS LIST OF PRESENT

### FELLOWS AND GRANTEES

A revised current Address List of Fellows and Grantees of the Council was issued in mid-September. This list, arranged geographically according to the places where the appointees are or will be working, is designed to encourage communication among those who are working near each other or on topics of mutual interest. Copies are being mailed to all persons listed, and will gladly be sent to others on request addressed to the Council's Washington office.

## SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

230 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK 17, N.Y.

*Incorporated in the State of Illinois, December 27, 1924, for the purpose of advancing research in the social sciences*

*Directors, 1953:* WENDELL C. BENNETT, RAY A. BILLINGTON, TAYLOR COLE, GORDON A. CRAIG, FRED EGGAN, CHARLES FAIRMAN, LUTHER GULICK, ROBERT B. HALL, ERNEST R. HILGARD, PENDLETON HERRING, E. ADAMSON HOEBEL, ALEXANDER H. LEIGHTON, DONALD G. MARQUIS, DOUGLAS MCGREGOR, JOHN P. MILLER, FREDERICK MOSTELLER, LOWRY NELSON, ROY F. NICHOLS, FREDERICK OSBORN, THEODORE W. SCHULTZ, ROBERT R. SEARS, MORTIMER SPIEGELMAN, GEORGE W. STOCKING, CONRAD TAEUBER, DOROTHY S. THOMAS, SCHUYLER C. WALLACE, HERBERT WECHSLER, S. S. WILKS, MALCOLM M. WILLEY, DONALD YOUNG

*Officers and Staff:* PENDLETON HERRING, *President*; PAUL WEBBINK, *Vice-President*; ELBRIDGE SIBLEY, *Executive Associate*; HAROLD E. JONES, *Pacific Coast Representative*; BRYCE WOOD; ELEANOR C. ISBELL; JOSEPH B. CASAGRANDE; M. BREWSTER SMITH; ROBERT N. WILSON; CAROLYN E. ALLEN, *Financial Secretary*